

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action dated May 5, 2005 rejects claims 1-21 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,609,203. The Action indicates that although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed invention found in claim 1 of the Patent and claim 1 of the application each are directed towards the same method of securely providing user information to a user machine adapted to operate in conjunction with an optically readable disc.

In response simply in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants submit herewith a terminal disclaimer for the present application. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection has been fully addressed and overcome, and allowance of the pending claims is requested.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Phillip M. Pippenger, Reg. No. 46,055
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: August 3, 2005



Application No. 09/721,299.

Terminal Disclaimer under 37 CFR 1.321

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this TERMINAL DISCLAIMER (along with any documents referred to as attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date:

8/3/05

Susan Matz

M:\Form\Patent Prosecution Forms - US\Terminal Disclaimer.doc (Rev. 7-2005)